

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed July 28, 2006. Claims 1-30 were pending in the present application. This Amendment amends claims 2, 3, 8, 10-12, 15, 17, 22, and 24; cancels claims 1, 4-7, 16, 23, and 25-27; and adds new claims 35-41; leaving pending in the application claims 2-3, 8-15, 17-22, 24, 28-30, and 35-41. Reconsideration of the rejected claims and consideration of the newly presented claims is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's helpful recommendation, as the Examiner has inferred on p. 2 of the Office Action that combining the limitations of claims 2, 3, or 9 and the limitations of claims 4-7 with the pending independent claims would likely be allowable over the cited art. Applicants agree that such combinations are neither taught nor suggested by *Halvinis*, *Melton*, and *Wortman*, discussed below, in any combination, such that claims reciting those combinations would not be rendered obvious by these references. As such, Applicants have amended the claims such that the pending independent claims (including the newly independent claims) recite the limitations of either previously pending claim 2 or 3, along with the limitations of previously pending claims 4-7, and the subject matter of the corresponding prior independent claim. As such, each of these independent claims now should be allowable over these references. Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of the pending independent claims as amended and all claims that depend therefrom.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Halvinis* (US 6,104,931) in view of *Melton* (US 5,255,306) and *Wortman* (US 5,884,221). Applicants respectfully submit that these references do not teach or suggest each element of these claims. For example, Applicants' claim 2 as amended recites a method for

monitoring a location of a wireless unit of interest across multiple wireless networks, comprising the steps of:

providing a system operative to procure location information for a wireless unit of interest from any of multiple location information sources associated with any of multiple wireless networks;

establishing an interface for communications between said system and an entity requesting location information for said wireless unit of interest, wherein said interface defines a standardized format for requesting and providing said location information;

verifying authorization for said entity to obtain location information for said wireless unit of interest independent of location finding preferences of said wireless unit of interest;

obtaining, from said system, location information for said wireless unit of interest when said wireless unit of interest is within any of multiple location zones covered by at least one of the multiple wireless networks, the obtaining including overriding a privacy setting associated with said wireless unit of interest where necessary to obtain the location information;

analyzing the location information to monitor a location of the wireless unit over time;
and

providing said monitored location information to a recipient associated with said request, wherein said establishing step allows a requesting entity to define at least one trigger event for triggering the monitoring of the location of the wireless unit of interest, the trigger event including at least one of a schedule, said wireless unit one of sending and receiving wireless communications, and said wireless unit being identified relative to an area of interest, and

wherein said establishing step further allows a requesting entity to define at least one said area of interest, when used as a trigger event, including at least one of an address, a point and radius, another wireless unit, and a geographic boundary

(emphasis added). As discussed above, such limitations are neither taught nor suggested by *Halvinis*, *Melton*, and *Wortman*, in any combination, such that claim 2, and the claims that depend therefrom, cannot be rendered obvious by these references. The other independent claims recite limitations that similarly are neither taught nor suggested by these references, such that these claims and the claims that depend therefrom also cannot be rendered obvious by these references. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection with respect to claims 1-30 be withdrawn.

III. Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

IV. Newly Presented Claims


Claims 35-41 have been added to allow limitations that originally depended from claim 1 to now depend from claim 3, which has been re-written in independent form to include the limitations of previously pending claim 1. These claims are thus supported by the specification and do not add new matter. Applicants therefore respectfully request consideration and allowance of newly presented claims 35-41.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,


Jason D. Lohr
Reg. No. 48,163

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
JDL:jdl
60901379 v1